

REMARKS

Claims 6-14 and 16-21 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, independent claims 6 and 12 are amended to even more clearly distinguish over the applied references, claims 7 and 13 are amended for clarity, and withdrawn claims 1-5 and 22-35 are canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Applicant reserves the right to one or more divisional applications to pursue the non-elected claims. No new matter is added.

I. The Claims Are Patentable over the Applied References

The Office Action (1) rejects claims 6-14, 16-18 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,836,663 to Kotzin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,292,098 to Ebata et al. (Ebata); and (2) rejects claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kotzin and Ebata, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,646,676 to DaGraca et al. (DeGraca). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Regarding independent claims 6 and 12, the applied references fail to disclose or suggest a watching system in which "the mobile terminal is adapted to put a higher priority on the signal from the remote communication equipment than any other call except calls from the watching system."

Kotzin discloses a wireless communication device 100 having a wireless interface 102 and a network interface 104 (Fig. 2). Kotzin's wireless communication device 100 is designed to solve the problem of increasing wireless traffic that threatens to overload existing systems (col. 1, lines 29-31). Kotzin's wireless communication device 100 achieves this goal by (1) requesting network data from a proximal communications device prior to (2) requesting the data from a wide area network in the case when the data is not available from a proximate device, thus avoiding some wide area network communications (col. 1, lines 60-63).

The Office Action acknowledges that Kotzin fails to disclose (1) a watching camera; and (2) that the mobile terminal is adapted to put a higher priority on the signal from the remote communication equipment than any other call. The Office Action cites to Ebata as allegedly curing the deficiencies of Kotzin. The Office Action cites to Ebata, col. 10, lines 21-31 as disclosing that the mobile terminal places a higher priority on the signal received from the remote communication equipment.

Ebata discloses a surveillance system having cameras 40 (Fig. 1). An emergency transfer service is given priority over other communications. The emergency transfer service is used for large volumes of data (col. 10, lines 21-31), such as image data. The emergency transfer function is initiated by a person to view, for example, a suspicious person (col. 9, lines 54-63). All "calls" in Ebata come from within the surveillance system itself.

Ebata fails to cure the deficiencies of Kotzin because (1) one of ordinary skill would not have combined Ebata and Kotzin; and (2) even if combined, the proposed combination fails to disclose or suggest all the claimed features.

Kotzin is directed to a wireless communication device 100 such as a cellular phone. Ebata discloses a surveillance system. Neither reference discloses a problem in Kotzin (the primary reference) that would be cured by adding a surveillance system as disclosed by Ebata. Further, the rationale for combining the references provided by the Office Action, that one of ordinary skill would have combined the two references "to provide the ability to transfer high quality images in the case of an emergency to those monitoring the image data" is based only on hindsight, which is improper. First, Ebata already discloses adequate transmission infrastructure that is not disclosed as having any problem that would be solved by adding the wireless communication device 100 of Kotzin. Second, the wireless communication device 100 of Kotzin would provide no benefit to the system of Ebata. One of ordinary skill would have known that wireless communication devices such as Kotzin's wireless communication

device 100 cannot handle high bandwidth transmissions easily, and further, do not possess screens able to view large images. Large volumes of image data are just the kind of communications that Ebata's emergency transfer service is used for. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have added the wireless communication device 100 of Kotzin to the system of Ebata.

However, even if the proposed combination is made, the proposed combination fails to disclose the feature quoted above because Ebata discloses that communication from a camera 40 is given priority under the emergency transfer service as compared to transmissions from other cameras 40 or sensors 60. There is no disclosure in the applied references, taken alone or in combination, that Ebata's emergency transfer service would provide priority over other calls except from the watching system, as claimed. In contrast, Ebata discloses that the emergency transfer service is given priority over other calls from the watching system. DeGraca, cited as disclosing other features, does not cure the deficiencies of Kotzin and Ebata.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejections.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

Jonathan H. Backenstose
Registration No. 47,399

MAC:JHB/mef

Attachment:
Request for Continued Examination (RCE)

Date: April 9, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--